

## Executive Cabinet Defends Decisions

The Executive Cabinet of the Student Association would like to respond to the two controversial issues which arose toward the end of last semester. We hope to clarify the events and the actions taken. This will be our final statement of any kind.

Executive Cabinet in its endeavors to revise the present constitution of the Student Association was confronted with the question pertaining to Article VI Section 4. This question related to the legitimacy of Student Association officers to remain in their positions in regard to the definition of full-time student status. Article VI Section 4 states that "Eligibility for any office within the Executive Cabinet shall be dependent upon the maintenance of at least 20 cumulative grade point average, good social standing, full-time student status and the maintenance thereof throughout the tenure of the office." A student with full-time student status has been defined by the Administration as one who is taking less than twelve (12) semester credit hours and falls under any of the following categories: medical, financial, academic, or student service. The controversy arose due to the confusion between the definitions of full-time student and full-time student status. The definition of a full-time student, as stated in various college publications, is one who carries a minimum of twelve (12) semester credit hours, which is not to be confused with the definition of full-time student status as defined above.

The 1976-77 Executive Cabinet, early in the first semester, formulated the following statement:

"By virtue of the authority vested in the Executive Cabinet as stated in the Student Association Constitution Article V Section 1 delegating to it the power to regulate all activities undertaken by the Association and in Article V Section 5 delegating to the representatives of the Association the power to regulate all SA elections, the Cabinet declares the criteria for membership in all elected SA positions as good social standing and good academic standing, which is defined by the Dean's office as a 2.0 GPA and residential for full time equivalence status." (Minutes of the Executive Cabinet of the Student Association, September 27, 1976)

In the past, Student Association presidents as well as other members of the Executive Cabinet have carried less than the designated twelve (12) semester credit hours, and have yet maintained full-time student status. In keeping with this practice, Kathy Mayer was advised by her academic advisor to carry below twelve (12) semester credit hours during her tenure of office. This would enable her to effectively carry out her important and time-consuming responsibilities as President of the Student Association

while maintaining her level of academic achievement. Therefore it is obvious that no violation of the constitution has occurred. To insure that no confusion will arise in the future, the Executive Cabinet will include the written definition of full-time student status within the framework of the revised constitution.

Just prior to the Thanksgiving holiday, events occurred in Westmoreland Hall which necessitated immediate disciplinary action. Members of the Executive Cabinet were notified on Monday that a possible problem existed within the residence hall. On Tuesday, members of the Executive Cabinet were again notified of the recurring situation in Westmoreland Hall. Due to the early departure of Kathy Mayer for the Thanksgiving holiday, and the Administration's inability to contact her at home, Barb Stammerjohn was contacted. She was asked to represent the Executive Cabinet in a joint meeting with the Administration and the Residential Judicial Chairman, Wednesday morning, to discuss the severity of the situation at hand. Cindy Reeves, the Campus Judicial Chairman, was contacted at home and asked to return to school to represent judicial concerns at the aforementioned meeting.

The circumstances were presented to President Woodard by all present, Barb Stammerjohn, Scott Scherer, Cindy Reeves, and Dean Clement. Dr. Woodard had to leave at this point and the discussion continued during his brief absence. The general consensus of the group was that the best means for handling the problem was through an Administrative Hearing. The primary reasons for this decision were: vandalism; non-student involvement, i.e., residence director, campus police, and Dean Clement; semester long problems with previous solutions ineffective in stopping the behavior; the serious nature of the problems; and the general behavior showed consistent lack of respect for the residents of the dorm itself. The President of the Student Association and the Judicial Chairman were present as observers at the Administrative Hearing, as outlined in the Student Handbook pages 26-30.

With this statement we feel that we have sufficiently clarified the circumstances surrounding the actions taken by the Executive Cabinet concerning these issues. In the future we ask that any other questions, comments, or criticisms concerning the actions of the Executive Cabinet be addressed to the Executive Cabinet as a whole.

NOTE: In reference to the question at the open Student Body Meeting about judicial handling a vandalism charge last year: The files were checked and that case was not vandalism. It concerned breakage of bottles, not breakage of COLLEGE property.

## Capon, Eller to Provide Insights

By HELEN MARIE McFALLS

As the new semester gets underway and most of the campus reluctantly returns to the busy academic routine, the M.W.C. religion department proudly prepares for the arrival of two well-known and influential theologians, Robert Farrar Capon and Vernard Eller. An exciting two days of public addresses and discussions await the M.W.C. population. Capon will speak on the theme of "Theological Fascinations" on Monday, January 23rd in Lounge A, Ann Carter Lee Hall at 11 a.m. Eller will address an M.W.C. audience the next day, Tuesday, January 24th in Lounge A, Ann Carter Lee Hall at 4 P.M.

Capon is an Episcopal Priest and professor of theology. Previously he has served as Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Instructor in Greek and Dean of the George Mercer, Jr. Memorial School of Theology in Garden City, New York. His thought and literature can be described as outlandish, adventurous and fun. According to David Cain (professor of religion at M.W.C.), "Capon thinks that theology is or ought to be these things too. His writings show how theological concepts relate to feelings and concerns which we know and with which we can identify. Capon asks only honesty and our willingness to admit our ignorance, to laugh at ourselves—and

maybe with God." Capon's many works include *Hunting the Divine Fox* and *Exit 36*. Students of religion at M.W.C. encounter Capon's theology in some of Cain's courses. Vernard Eller is a professor of religion at LaVerne College in California. He is also the well-known author of many books including *The Promise: Ethics in the Kingdom of God* and *His*

End Up: Getting God into the New Theology. Eller's works combine a popular, humorous style with insightful, Christian, theological content. Many of David Cain's students encounter Eller in their theology studies. Cain describes Vernard Eller as someone who is "able to deal with complex issues in an incisive way with humor and humility. Eller never forgets that he is a human being—and he reminds us that we are too."

In anticipation of the upcoming visitors, Cain musely suggested, "Perhaps we should proclaim next week the Department of Religion Week at M.W.C. It is curious that for some eight years I've been trying to get both Capon and Eller to come and speak and now they are coming in two consecutive days. It should be an exciting time." The religion department eagerly welcomes anyone interested to seize the opportunity to hear and meet these modern theologians.

## Petition Circulates, Action Taken

By ANNE F. HAYES

Last December a number of petitions favoring the recall of S.A. President Kathy Mayer were circulated around campus. The petitions were headed by two paragraphs containing the following statements, as well as supporting information: "We, the undersigned, feel that the actions of Student Association President Kathleen P. Mayer in the 'Westmoreland 4' case necessitate her recall or resignation" and "Secondly, Ms. Mayer is holding office illegally."

The petitions are in keeping with Article X, Amendment I (Recall) of the Student Association Constitution. Section 3 of Amendment I upholds: "Upon petition of twenty percent of the electorate for said office, the question of recall shall be considered. A quorum of the electorate must vote in favor of recall in order for the motion to be carried and a student official to be recalled by his constituency."

for surgery for Dr. Disraeli. Many continued to donate blood over the period of his illness.

Dr. Disraeli returned to teaching briefly the following semester, but again entered the hospital.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Ruth Disraeli, and a daughter, Sharon Disraeli, both of the home; and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Disraeli of New York City.

A memorial service was held at 7:30 p.m. December 15 at Beth Shalom Temple.

According to Barbara Stone, Senate Rules and Procedures Chairman, the petitions will require between 400 and 450 signatures. Of the petitions, Ms. Stone commented: "I look at this situation as the students' privilege, if they want to do this, then that's O.K. I think it is kind of silly, though, because the Administration is not going to think the petitions are valid. They don't have much of a case against Kathy."

Gary Webb, one of the students who circulated the petitions, made the following statement: "The petition for the recall of SA President Kathy Mayer originated in the aftermath of the Open Student Body Meeting of December 6, 1977. Many students were not satisfied by Ms. Mayer's explanation of the course-load situation. (Ms. Mayer was, and is, taking 10 credit hours. Many students feel that The Handbook requires a Student Association officer to carry at least 12 hours per semester). Some also felt that Ms. Mayer could have done more to obtain a fair trial for the 'Westmoreland Four'. (She was a witness at the Administrative Hearing—which some feel was almost a kangaroo court and certainly a mockery of our Judicial System.)"

"Because of these incidents," Webb continued, "it was decided by a group of M.W.C. students to circulate a petition for the recall of President Mayer, in accordance with the recall procedure set forth in The Student Handbook. The response to the petition was most encouraging. Several copies have been circulating around the campus, with at least one in every dorm." The petitions now reportedly contain over 200 student signatures.

Ms. Sue Maloney, Student Association Whip, was also asked to comment on the petitions. "I discussed the petition with Kathy and a couple of other people. I think it was a good idea because if you have a grievance, you have a right to petition. It was almost certain that they would not get enough signatures, because the whole thing was started during exams."

"The petition against Kathy was criticized for not having been researched enough, Miss Maloney said. "The petition for her was equally un-researched and invalid because they (the writers) felt that if they got enough signatures they could stop the other petition... I still think the petition for recall was valid." She added: "I think it's a shame that it came to this."

Former Vice-President of the Senate Jim Boyd, who worked with the petitions, was contacted for a statement on the petitions. Boyd stated that he was busy watching the Superbowl with guests and did not have time to comment.

Of the petitions favoring her recall as S.A. President, Kathy Mayer said: "Mary Washington College students have the constitutional right to petition and to express their views and opinions, but I feel the right decisions and actions have been made in all instances."

## Death of a Friend Shocks MWC Community



Photo courtesy of THE BATTLEFIELD

Benjamin W. Early, fall of 1977.

## Dedication

THE BULLET staff would like to dedicate this issue to Benjamin W. Early. Those who knew Early were undoubtedly affected by his quest for knowledge and his never-ending desire to share his experiences with others. We are honored to have had the opportunity to have been briefly touched by his sensitivity.

Professor Benjamin W. Early, a professor of English at Mary Washington College since 1948, died at his home Friday, January 13, 1978. Early, 68, was a resident of 1400 Kenmore Avenue, and a member of the choir at St. George's Episcopal Church in Fredericksburg.

Mr. Early is survived by his wife, Margaret, and sister, Mrs. Arthur Love of Richmond.

A memorial service was held at 2 p.m. Monday at St. George's Episcopal Church, followed by burial at Oak Hill Cemetery. The Reverend Charles Snyder officiated.

Early received the B.A. and Masters Degrees from the University of Virginia and a Ph.D. from Duke University.

Dean Emeritus Edward Alvey Jr.,

a long-time friend of Early, remembers the professor best for his roles in M.W.C. plays. In *The History of Mary Washington College 1908-1972*, Alvey wrote: "As a colleague has noted, in his long career, Dr. Early never failed to contribute his intelligence, taste, and vitality to every role, whether a walk-on part or a lead in the play." Alvey described the deceased as "a person who enjoyed life a great deal. He was one of the kindest, gentlest persons I have ever known."

Benjamin will be remembered in the hearts and minds of many of his students and faculty associates, especially for his eloquent recitations of Romanticism poetry. He will be missed, but not forgotten.

## Woodard Addresses Current Controversy

By ANNE F. HAYES

"So many students don't know what is in The Handbook. If they are truly concerned that everyone is trying to develop a good education, they should know what is in print," said President Prince B. Woodard in a recent interview about his letter to the student body of January 9, 1978. Woodard answered questions concerning the controversial Westmoreland '4' case (BULLET—December 8, 1977) and the current dispute over the definition of full-time student status.

In his letter Woodard referred to "erroneous and invalid statements about the role and status of officers of S.A." When questioned about this point, the President admitted he was referring to "invalid statements" which appear on the petitions to recall S.A. President Kathy Mayer. The petitions are currently circulating around campus.

In regard to Administrative Hearings, Woodard said that one such Hearing was held during his first year of office at M.W.C. He said he knows of no Administrative Hearings planned for the near future.

"I am ultimately responsible for

any Administrative Policy at the College," said Woodard. He specified that the President's Cabinet holds a joint discussion to decide when students, for "medical, academic, financial, and other qualifying" reasons should be exempt from the 12-hour residential requirement. Woodard, however, makes the final decision in such cases. The President also stated that several students carrying less than 12 credit hours were living on campus last semester.

Woodard responded negatively to a question that was also asked Kathy Mayer at the Open Student Body Meeting of December 6, 1977. When asked if he thought that allowing certain residential students to carry fewer than 12 credit hours was putting more weight on extra-curricular activities than academics, Woodard said "No."

Woodard was especially concerned with making a distinction about the full-time student status issue. He repeatedly pointed out that nowhere in the S.A. Constitution does it state that a student must carry 12 hours to be eligible for an Executive Cabinet position.

## In Memorium

Dr. A. Stephen Disraeli, 34, of 183 Longstreet Ave., died December 13 at George Washington University Hospital after a long illness.

Dr. Disraeli was assistant professor of linguistics at Mary Washington College. He received his bachelor's degree from New York University, and his master's degree and doctorate from Indiana University, and French

article courtesy of The Free Lance-Star

certificates from McGill University and Université de Dijon.

Dr. Disraeli took a leave of absence in 1978 due to illness, an intestinal disease. In January of that year, area residents, and Mary Washington faculty and students gathered at a bloodmobile held by the Fredericksburg chapter of the American Red Cross to donate more than 100 units of blood



Photo by Paul Hawke

LOOK OUT BELOW... Madison residents bombard unsuspecting passersby.

Editorials

Executive Cabinet Officials:  
Who Do They Represent?

Who wields the power at Mary Washington College and to whom do the student government officials channel their influences in decision and policy making?

It seems that the student body is being misdirected, or, more precisely, misled into believing that the majority of our student leaders are representing those who elected them. The current controversial issues plaguing MWC have prompted the realization that our only power lies within the whims and impulses of our student leaders.

The full-time student status debate, which is admittedly growing tiresome, has provided me with the opportunity to assess the judgment and standards of the administration and student officials. Students protest that President Woodard has no right allowing the S.A. President to carry only 10 hours. But President Woodard does have the right, and the power, and the authority—and he has obviously exerted this privilege. By believing that we can eradicate this power we are showing our extreme ignorance. We are utterly helpless in the face of the absolute power of which President Woodard reminded us in his letter to the student body. We must acknowledge this power. I readily acknowledge it; I must even reluctantly accept it.

What we can protest is the intermediate step in this hopeless triangle—our student representatives. Granted, these officials cannot make ultimate decisions of any importance. They can, and have however, a) specifically requested that an Administrative Hearing occur in the Westmoreland Four case, rather than a joint or judicial hearing, and b) requested that certain individuals be exempted from rules which apply to most other students.

The decisions President Woodard made in these two cases did not originate in an unnatural lust for power, or anything of the sort. They were undeniably prompted by our representatives—the officials whom we elected to respond to our needs, our desires, and our demands. President Woodard would not have given the S.A. President permission to carry 10 credit hours if she had not requested him to do so. The decision to expel three men from Westmoreland would not have been placed in the hands of one person if our student representatives had not decided that the matter was too severe for us to handle. President Woodard has no need of a representative. The students, however, will suffer intensely if they are denied the only power they indirectly possess.

Perhaps it is too late to allow the "Westmoreland 4" to be tried by a joint council. Perhaps the same decision would have been reached by the joint council. What is important here is not the outcome of the trial, but that our elected officials placed the decision in someone else's hands. When we elected our student representatives, we asked THEM to be the decision-makers. We said: "It is impossible for 2,400 students to make every decision. You decide for us. We trust you."

I don't feel trusting. I feel cheated and misled. I feel that in some cases the S.A.'s power was abused—and in some cases that it was not exercised to the fullest extent necessary.

If we do possess any power, and I am not sure if we do, then it can only be exercised through our student representatives. If they represent themselves and not their constituents, if they represent an absolute power instead of those who are helpless—then we are indeed on a sinking ship. The reason the S.A. has any power at all is because of us—we elected them to office. They are obliged to respond to our protests. They are required to take action to eliminate our disapproval.

P.A.R.

Viewpoint (CON.)

Viewpoint

Hearing, the men were denied the due process of law guaranteed to them by the Handbook as well as the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

It is wrong to blame the decision to convene an Administrative Hearing on Woodard, for the decision to turn this case over to the College President was not made by Woodard alone; it was a joint decision made by Cindy Reeves, Judicial Chairman, Barbara Stammerjohn (who was filling in for the absent S.A. President Kathy Mayer), and Scott Sharer, Westmoreland Judicial Representative. Ms. Reeves was most emphatic on this point. In a taped interview, I asked her "if it was the students, not the Administration, who decided to send this case to Administrative Hearing." Her reply was a forceful "yes."

Of these three students, Ms. Reeves bears the brunt of the responsibility for the decision. This was a judicial matter and her job is to be aware of and proficiencies in judicial matters; such matters are her specialty within the S.A. The Handbook states that she is "the official representative of the Student Association in all matters of judicial concern." Sharer was her subordinate; she is "responsible for all Residence Hall Judicial Chairman." Stammerjohn as SA Vice President has no official concern with judicial matters, and hence was present primarily in an advisory capacity. Thus, the person most concerned with judicial matters, the person whom we hope is as close to an expert on judicial practices and procedures that we have, the person most responsible for the decision to convene an Administrative Hearing to dispose of this case, was Cindy Reeves.

Reeves based this decision on essentially four grounds. First, she said that Judicial Court or Joint Council could not handle the case because non-students were "involved"—Dean Clement, a campus police officer, and the Resident Hall Advisor testified at the Administrative Hearing. But non-students, particularly campus police and dorm mothers, frequently testify at both Judicial and Joint trials, a fact which Ms. Reeves herself acknowledged.

This is particularly true in visitation cases, for obvious reasons: the Handbook provides that the "Dean of Student Services, accompanied by the Residence Hall Director" should be present when a student's room is searched for a suspected violation of a college rule or regulation. Further, "the College Police may assist in such a search." Ms. Reeves' principle of

handing all cases in which non-students are "involved" over to the Administration, if applied in all such cases, would mean that Woodard would be trying almost all of the cases which now are handled by Judicial Court and Joint Council. No doubt President Woodard would deal fairly with all of these cases, but his time is too valuable to waste trying Judicial and Joint Council cases; Ms. Reeves point might have some credence if these non-students were plaintiffs in this Westmoreland Four case, but she herself stated that the charges were brought by a student: Scott Sharer. Dean Juanita Clement, Mrs. Janet Barnes and the officer were only witnesses; as Mrs. Keel and Officer Prescott were witnesses at a Joint Council trial last year and Lonnie Stuterward was a witness at the Madison Judicial trial last year.

Secondly, Ms. Reeves claims that there was a "loophole" in the section of the Handbook concerning Noise Violations. Scott Sharer, who brought this "loophole" to her attention, explained: "let's say that you're in a room and I come and tell you its too noisy, would you please turn it (the stereo) down. I have to give you a warning, and if you turn it down, then that's the end of the incident. Well, if you're noisy the next night, I have to give you another warning; it's treated as a separate incident. So even if I must come to your room every night and ask you to turn it down, and you do, then I can't give you any hall offenses. That was particularly a problem here. When I asked them to turn it down, they did. But it was happening every night." I will not argue the pros and cons of this warning requirement here, but in any case this "loophole" does not mean that Judicial or Joint could not take this case. Ms. Reeves has stated that no hall offenses are necessary before these bodies may try a case involving a noise complaint. Noise problems are specifically mentioned in the Handbook under Joint jurisdiction; further, one of Joint Council's jobs is to "hear cases of extreme complexity." This noise matter seems to be such a case; this "loophole" thus is not a valid reason for taking the extreme and, to my knowledge, unprecedented step of handing a Joint Council case over to Administrative Hearing.

Thirdly, Ms. Reeves asserts that a "time element" problem necessitated the convening of an Administrative Hearing; "an immediate solution was needed. A lot of people were upset." So Ms. Reeves, Ms. Stammerjohn and Scott Sharer concluded that because of

the immediacy of the problem, the four men should be removed from the dorm until an Administrative Hearing could be convened. But the moment they did this, the "time element problem" ceased to be a problem: the animals were now safely separated from the Good Students of Westmoreland, and the immediacy of the final disposition of the case took on a whole new light. If the four men could be removed from the dorm until Administrative Hearing could be convened, why could they not be similarly removed until Joint Council could be convened? One must wonder how relevant this "time element problem" was to the three students' decision to convene an Administrative Hearing, how heavily it weighed on their minds. They decided to temporarily remove the four from the dorm only after they decided that the Administration should ultimately try the case.

Fourthly, Ms. Reeves claims that neither Judicial nor Joint could hear this case because vandalism was involved, an offense not specifically within the Jurisdiction of these bodies. She states that this is a good point here, but one could argue just as forcefully that vandalism is not specifically out of the realm of Judicial or Joint either particularly in light of the fact (agreed to by Ms. Reeves) that the need must be extremely compelling before the convening of an Administrative Hearing may be justified. Further, Judicial Courts in the past (as recently as last year) have heard and passed judgement on cases involving vandalism, although the vandalism was not committed against College property. When MWC property is involved, a problem arises because only the College may assess for damages. But this problem may be solved in the following manner: Judicial or Joint Council could decide innocence or guilt and then the Administration could assess the accused student for recompense in the event of a guilty verdict.

I can sympathize with Ms. Reeves' position as she met with her two fellow students, President Woodard and Dean Clement on that Wednesday morning. With exams staring her in the face and a complicated case before her, maybe she cannot really be blamed for an error in judgment. Perhaps the thing that bothers me the most about Ms. Reeves' decision is that she is still defending it to the hilt and, worse still, she is ready to repeat it again and again. Ms. Reeves made a mistake. She should admit it.

Constitutional Revisions  
Call for Responsible Action

Change is in the air. In a progressive society this is inevitable. Some of us like to think that Mary Washington, too, is looking for improvement. The actions of last semester indeed suggest that we are.

The large turnout at the Open Student Body Meeting of December 6, 1977 was a fine indication of campus spirit and enthusiasm. What was witnessed there was a concern on the part of many students, a concern that things should definitely be set straight. These students should be commended for pointing out discrepancies in the S.A. Constitution and the officials who enforce it, as well as expressing dissatisfaction with the manner in which the Westmoreland 4 case was handled.

Hopefully the S.A. Executive Cabinet will keep the reasons for student discontent over the Constitution uppermost in their minds when they make Constitutional revisions. These proposed revisions will be put before the student body for voting in the annual March S.A. elections.

Since the S.A. Constitution, which has been described by some students as a 'farce,' plays such a very important role in student life (as demonstrated in the current full-time student status dispute), it is essential that each student carefully evaluate the proposed revisions and amendments when they are made public.

Change can only come if it is initiated. Perhaps most of us are already aware of gross discrepancies in the body of the Constitution itself. When the petitions for recall of S.A. President Kathy Mayer were first circulated, it was realized that the Constitution is very brief on this issue. This matter, and others of dire importance need clarification. Let's hope that the interests of dissatisfied students are served in the March elections.

A.F.H.

Letters

The following letter is reprinted by request of Sheila Willis, former chairman of the M.W.C. Radio Committee.

Ms. Sheila Willis:

We, Susan Johnson, Cindy Hefflin, Jim Boyd, and Mark McCoy, in name of the Day Students Association, appeal to Sheila Willis for a public retraction of the PROMETHEUS article on October 13, 1977 entitled "Radio Committee Answers Day Student Criticisms." Specifically, we would like a retraction to the second paragraph: "It has always been stated in the plans for the station that the day student lounge would have coverage."

We feel that this is "a deliberate, unjustifiable misrepresentation of the truth" (MWC Handbook, page 109). It is the belief that if this retraction is not in the next issue of THE BULLET, then we will take the necessary appropriate action.

Respectively,  
CYNTHIA D. HEFLIN  
SUSAN JOHNSON  
JAMES H.A. BOYD  
MARK MCCOY

Once more the issue of Day Students and the Campus Radio is carried to the paper in order to get the information out to the entire student body. Residential and non-residential students must know the facts of the situation in an effort to stop the growing isolation between these two components of the campus. This split is not only in the case of the proposed radio but over several issues and I know how often both sides know all the facts.

In the past I had felt the best way to work out the problems between the Radio Committee and the Day Students was through consultation with the Day Student President, Mark McCoy. That method resulted in an accusation that I was playing Henry Kissinger. I'm both flattered and angered by the implications—flattered by the compliment of high level diplomacy and angered by the insult of secret dealings. So I'll no longer rely on President McCoy as the main contact with the Day Students.

The controversy began late this past September when it was pointed out by the non-residential students that the proposed hours for broadcasting were inconvenient. The question of the mechanics of the reception of the signal in the Day Student Lounge was also raised. I am not an engineer and this question is beyond my ability to explain; however, the issue over the hours was a little embarrassing. The hours was a little embarrassing. The student who had previously served on the Radio Committee had never advised the rest of the Committee which hours would be best for the non-residential population. As a result their needs were not considered as different from the rest of the student body. Mark McCoy informed me just how upset his constituents were and together we tried to work out an equitable settlement.

In reference to the signal reception I could only rely on spoken information given me by four broadcast equipment companies: Long Engineering, Old Dominion Broadcasting Engineering Service, AVEEC Electronics Corporation, and MCB Laboratories. During April and May of 1977, the representatives of each of these

Please see page three

Viewpoint

Westmoreland '4': Our  
Judicial System on Trial

By MICHAEL MELLO

Like any disciplinary proceeding, the "Westmoreland Four" case has many different aspects to it. Often it is important to keep these aspects mentally separate. In particular, one must make a distinction between the ultimate verdict of punishment, and the manner in which that decision was reached—the process. The judgment and punishment in the case was justifiable; it is difficult to find fault with President Woodard's actions here. The procedure for an Administrative Hearing delineated on pages 28-30 of the Handbook were scrupulously followed. More importantly, the severity of the punishments may be justifiable because the Administration apparently

proved its case against the four men—in both charges of the indictment. The noise count was never really in doubt; the defendants admitted that they often played their stereos too loud. The vandalism charge was more complex, since no evidence was presented at the Hearing which directly linked any of the four men to any acts of malicious vandalism; but, none was needed. A fifth student, who lives in another dorm and was a frequent guest of the four Westmoreland men, had admitted committing some of the damage for which The Four were charged. And the Handbook provides that "Anyone in a residence hall to which he or she is not assigned a room by the college is considered a

guest... All guests must abide by the rules and regulations of the college and the student is responsible for the conduct of his guest at all times. Any damages to property will be paid by the students and/or guest." Thus were the Westmoreland Four indirectly tied to and liable for the vandalism for which they were charged. There was no glaring and obvious injustice in Woodard's verdict in the case. But what truly bothers me about the whole affair is not the ultimate decision, but rather the process by which that decision was made. Specifically, the Westmoreland Four should have been tried by Joint Council and by being tried instead by President Woodard alone in an Administrative

The Bulletin

Mary Washington College is an affirmative action equal employment opportunity institution. It does not discriminate against any person for reasons of age, sex, marital status, race, nationality, religion, or political affiliation.

The STAFF OF THE BULLET

Photography Editor.....	Thomas Vandever
Advertising Managers.....	Ruth Gormley, Helen Marie McFalls
Circulation Manager.....	Patrick Everett
Sports Editor.....	Candy Sams
Photographer.....	Paul Hawke
Cartoonist.....	Tom Buchanan
Graphics Artist.....	Alison Scheuing
Secretary.....	Amanda Parker
Staff.....	Linda Sheridan, John Coski, Susan Morrow, Vicki Reynard, Laurie Shelor, Terry Purvis, Cindy Goforth, Gretchen Burman, Kathryn Otto, Philip Leonard, Missy Baker, Jane Opitz, Mary Lee, Dean Ball, Patrick Thompson.



# Letters

From page 7

companies came to the campus separately to determine the cost of establishing a radio station. These gentlemen answered my questions and each assured me then that reception in AGL, even in the lounge, would not be an engineering problem. I related this to McCoy this morning.

To rectify the oversight in planning the station hours, eventually Mr. McCoy and I agreed on an amendment that was attached to the Radio Committee's proposal to the Finance Committee. This stated that a set number of hours during certain hours of the day must be available for broadcasting. We felt that a written item was needed, not because of the lack of good faith between residential and non-residential students, but to give the often-overlooked Day Students leverage in the future when the principle people in this agreement have left the campus. The proposal was submitted November 1 and subsequently approved.

On December 7, 1977 I received a letter signed by Cynthia Hefflin, Susan Johnson, James Boyd, and Mark McCoy demanding a public retraction of an article appearing in PROMETHEUS October 13, 1977. They particularly requested a retraction from the second paragraph where I had written "It has always been stated in the plans for the station that the Day Student Lounge would have coverage." I was startled that after a month of having heard very little, such a letter came just prior to the last day of classes.

Despite the statement in the letter that these four students "will take the necessary appropriate action," if a retraction is not in the next issue of THE BULLET, I find that in all honesty, I cannot make such a statement. In the nearly three years that I have been involved with the Radio Project, I have heard much said about the benefits to be accrued by both residential and non-residential students.

Also I know that after the initial information gathering in 1975-76, Day Student Lounge coverage was considered a matter of course and the only question was how it would best be done, not if it would be done. The Radio Committee and myself have neither slighted nor lied to anyone in this matter.

If these four students wish to press on with this issue, I advise them to check with the former members of the Radio Committee in the period between October 1975 to the present

time, and those representatives of the companies consulted. But instead of arguing over flimsy charges, perhaps the energies of these Day Student representatives could best be spent looking into the ways their constituency can be served by a campus radio. Maybe they could even find a way to be better informed and a better way to inform.

Sheila Willis

## DEAR EDITOR:

Dr. Johnson gave us a new perspective on an old argument when, in the last issue of the "Bullet," he wrote that our campus newspaper "is anything but an example of a free press" because it receives a portion of the mandatory student activities fee and is allotted one room for an office. And if one accepts his definition of a "free press," then Dr. Johnson is correct.

I do not, however, accept Dr. Johnson's definition of a free press: it seems to me that the most crucial factor is editorial freedom, the absence of censorship, not the origin of a publication's funding. The question of funding is relevant only insofar as it affects a newspaper editor's ability to decide, free of external pressures, what is to be printed and what is not. There is no evidence that indicates that either the Administration or the Senate Finance Committee, which determines the amount of college funding the BULLET receives, has ever forcefully censored the paper. The "Bullet" will cease to be a free press only when its editors surrender their discretion as editors.

This raises the matter of possible censorship of our school newspaper. The "Bullet" was heavily censored last year, and this goes a long way toward explaining the quality of last year's paper. But the censors were not in G.W. they were the "Bullet" editors themselves. These editors didn't wait for the Administration to strip them of their First Amendment rights; they did it themselves.

Since Dr. Woodard assumed the Presidency, the Administration has had little reason to want to censor THE BULLET. True, writers and editors like Eleanor Jones, former Editor-in-Chief, occasionally wrote editorials which bordered on the libelous (the best example is Ms. Jones' "Privacy and Student Records," October 4, 1976 BULLET), but those were usually so obviously absurd and self-discrediting that censorship was not worth the effort. It is only when reporting is factual, reasoned and accurate that censorship may enter the minds of the Administration, because only then does the student press pose a threat to the Powers in G.W.

Thankfully, even these attacks were fairly infrequent. And what else was there about the BULLET that the Administration or anyone else might want to censor? The movie reviews? The sports page? The cartoons which were bought from a national syndicate? The complaints about Seacobeck?

Of course, this year (so far, at least) it's different. The changes in the BULLET's tone, which I strongly believe are for the better, may be seen on every page of the paper, but perhaps the best example is in the realm of MWC's version of "Justice." Last year, there was a major Joint Council trial which dealt with the Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter called "the very essence of our civil liberties"; due process of law. THE BULLET's coverage of it consisted of three letters-to-the-editor. Compare this with THE BULLET's handling of the Pam Burrow's Honor trial and the "Westmoreland Four" case last semester.

Perhaps, if THE BULLET follows the course of courageous and incisive journalism that it set for itself earlier in the year, GW will begin to put the screw to our College newspaper. But I don't think so, for three reasons. First, as Anne Hayes wrote recently, "a free and responsible press is a vital aspect of any environment." I think the Administration, and particularly Dr. Woodard, is dedicated to this principle. Perhaps his toleration of the BULLET's unfair treatment of him last year is evidence of this (see the September 23, 1974, September 27, 1976 and October 4, 1977 issues of THE BULLET in particular). Secondly, after a year of inept journalism he may actually welcome factual, reasoned criticism; particularly when it offers practical and realistic alternatives. The third reason is the Administration censorship of a student press is illegal, and I think our own Administration has had its fill of lawsuits for a while. Students received their Bill of Rights in 1969, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that students do not "shed their constitutional rights of freedom of speech or expression at the school-house gate."

The case was *Tinker vs. Des Moines School District* (393 US 503 1969). It is available in our library, and every student should read it in its entirety. Part of the Court's 7 to 2 judgment states that "in order for the State in the person of school officials to justify prohibition of a particular expression of opinion, it must be able to show that its action was caused by something more than a mere desire to avoid the discomfort and unpleasantness that always accompany an unpopular

viewpoint. Certainly where there is no showing that the exercise of the forbidden right would 'materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school,' the prohibition cannot be sustained.

"... schools may not be enclaves of totalitarianism. School officials do not possess absolute authority over their students. Students in school as well as out of school are 'persons' under our Constitution. They are possessed of fundamental rights which the State must respect, just as they themselves must respect their obligations to the State. In our system, students may not be regarded as closed-circuit recipients of only that which the State chooses to communicate. They may not be confined to the expression of those sentiments that are officially approved. In the absence of a specific showing of constitutionally valid reasons to regulate their speech, students are entitled to freedom of expression of their views."

Thus, if Dr. Johnson was speaking of censorship when he accused THE BULLET of being "anything but an example of a free press," I must respectfully disagree. If not then he misused the term "free press." At the very least, his letter is poorly timed. In the past, Dr. Woodard didn't need to censor the paper; its editors did it for him. And it still remains to be seen whether the Powers That Be in GW will foolishly attempt censorship in the face of such responsible pieces of journalism as "Blame Enough for All" in the November 11 issue, Helen McFalls December 8, 1977 editorial on Kathy Mayer, Thomas Vandever's piece on Dean Rusk, in which he agrees that our DVIR "is truly a criminal," and Elliot Wentz's article on the Pam Burrow's Honor trial.

MICHAEL MELLO

## Dear Editor:

I call your attention to the editorial "I never promised you a rose garden." I agree academics may not hold the interest of students today, but I do not agree that there is a general loss of learning motivation. Recreation is a basic need of all students, not a pitfall. Pressures are greater than ever before for the college student. There are many who strive for the best grades in college and fall in their social lives ... and where do you make the transition into a career—with your personality or your grades? Certainly grades do often reflect motivation, but students can no longer look forward to the American dream the way they once did. Loss of confidence in the system, the failure of the work system to provide jobs, and a basic breakdown in the social structure of

our society have left us all with doubts and fears about obtaining the good life.

Agreed, college is a fantasy world for some, but a growing number of students are paying their own way through college, becoming more involved in campus life, suffering family problems, and preoccupying themselves with the problems our previous generations have handed us. I can't agree, Mrs. Ringle, when the suicidal

rate at this age level remains so high, that college students have it as easy as you claim. It is our very uncertainties about our futures that make life at this stage of the game so hard to swallow. At least many of our superiors have jobs, careers, or families. What do we really know about our futures? It is this factor of uncertainty that makes our pampered lives miserable. Let us build upon this knowledge. John Patrick Thompson

# "Auld Acquaintance"

By VICKI REYNARD

We're all well acquainted with the wonderfully open social atmosphere which accompanies the festive spirit (or should I say spirits) of New Year's Eve; too well acquainted, perhaps. After only four years of New Year's Eve parties, I find myself wondering if I'll be able to bear the countless years of them which lie ahead. Aside from minor variations (like house, host, and assorted company), they all seem to be pretty much the same—from the annual dousing to the regretful morning-after.

I must admit, they've gotten better as the years progress.

And time certainly has flown ... why, this year those of us in the class of '77 were the returning grade even then, the evening was not one I particularly looked forward to, in spite of all the splendor usually lavished upon the returning "college woman" (or man) by the "younger" generation. After two victorious, previous returns, Homecoming and Thanksgiving, the welcome begins to wear thin. So do the questions:

"Gee, what is college really like?" (What can you say to the kid? Tell him you're Joe Partier and you really haven't attended any classes yet! Or admit the fact that you scarcely ever pull your nose out of a book to find out (well, hardly ever ...)?

"How's your roommate?" (They're dying to hear that you fight like cats and dogs, turned her in for keeping a guy overnight, or perpetrated some unreal act of violence on your suite-mates with her—as long as it's good gossip and sounds collegiate.)

"Did you know Ken Doe (an ex-boyfriend from ninth grade) is taking out Suzie Sleazebum?" (Did you know I couldn't care less?)

And then there's always the inevitable "Oh, where did you say you're going?"

In any case, I was not looking forward to a New Year's Eve grilling session. And I knew things were taking a turn for the worse when we walked in and a bevy of sophomores

behind us cried "OH! They're all so old! I don't want to go into this party—they'll kick us out!" Suddenly I felt like the one who didn't belong.

Upon entering the party, we immediately encountered several old classmates already drenched with holiday spirits. It was interesting to see how everyone had changed (or hadn't) ... especially those of us who had ventured the farthest from home. There was the class nature boy, who came back from Montana with a face full of whiskers and fur-lined boots, hat, and jeans jacket. And the brunette who went to Florida and came back looking like a very blond Malibu Barbie. Not to mention the one who went to Georgia and came back with the most remarkable southern accent.

Closer to home, there was a guy who went away rather funny looking and came back looking more like Burt Reynolds ... but still acting rather funny. And the cheerleader who got married this summer and started her family in November. Even the diehard U.Va. guys who insisted they would never pre-pout came back wearing button-downs and topsiders. Yes, things do change ... some. Yet the most remarkable change was that in the old class spirit. Bolstered by countless six-packs and old memories, the holiday spirits caused several bouts of "gee, don't you wish we were still back in high school" to spread through the old home gang. The funny thing was, the old home gang that was standing around reminiscing really never stood around together much in high school, and a lot of the good old memories seemed touched up with a rosier hue.

Gee, isn't New Year's Eve great? Why, if it wasn't for that wonderful night we probably would never have known what good friends we had all been. And just think ... next year we can all sit around and talk about how great it was to sit around and talk about how great it was to sit around and talk about how great ...



Under new ownership  
and management of Cap'n Fred's  
a division of Biftac, Inc.

Open 7 days a week  
11 a.m. to 10 p.m.

In Park & Shop Shopping Center

This week's  
MWC Special:  
Whale-of-a-burger

(a 7 oz. hamburger with  
french fries)

**\$1.39**

only with student I.D.



# The December Administrative Hearings:

By HELEN MARIE MCFALLS, MICHAEL MELLO, PATRICIA A. RINGLE and GARY WEBB

An interview conducted with Cindy Reeves, Judicial chairman and witness at the Administrative Hearing.

Mello: Cindy, precisely what was your role, as Judicial Chairman, in the disposition of the "Westmoreland Four" case?

Reeves: At the beginning of the year, I had occasion to send letters to two of the individuals. The Campus Police had reported to me that they had been seen using the back doors of Westmoreland, so I sent them a warning letter.

M: Who were they? We have their permission...

R: John Bartenstein and Steve Calhoun. They a little bit later on, Scott Sharer, Judicial Chairman for Westmoreland, called me and said that there had been a visitation violation in that dorm. He didn't say who was involved; I didn't learn that it was Peter Back and John Bartenstein until the Administrative Hearing. Scott thought that it would be better to handle it within the dorm than to take it to Judicial Trial. He said that the dorm president, the accused individuals, the dorm mother, and himself had sat down and agreed on a penalty: closing the back doors for a week. Scott got their signatures in writing that they would comply with this punishment.

M: You were not present at this consultation?

R: No, I was not even aware of their names. Scott just called me up and asked if this procedure was O.K. with me and I said yes.

M: Is that a common practice—dealing with visitation violations within the dorm rather than going to court?

R: This is about the only time it has occurred this semester. That was all I heard of the matter until Monday, November 21, when Scott called me and said that there was a really bad vandalism problem in the hall. Several things had been broken and there was also a noise problem. He asked me for suggestions on how to deal with these problems. Nobody was coming forward and saying "so and so did it," so he could do something about it. People were complaining, but nobody was ready to give names.

I told him that it's stated in The Handbook that the hall will be accessed for the damages. If nobody would come forth and say "I did it" or nobody would bring somebody up and say "so and so did it," then the whole hall would pay for the damages. I also said that if the damage continued, since it was College property being destroyed, the Administration would have to step in.

At this point, he didn't want to go to the Administration; he still wanted to try and work it out within the dorm.

M: This was the Monday before Thanksgiving?

R: Yes, I left for home Tuesday afternoon and Dean Clement called me there. She said that she had been over to Westmoreland to assess the damages. While she was there, she heard some loud noises coming from the hall and when she went to see what was going on, there was a big trash can of vomit in the middle of the floor. There was vomit around the trash can, as well as garbage throughout the floor. There were also people running in and out and causing a commotion; she put a stop to that right there.

M: Did she say that she saw what Mitch Spurr termed "a group of several people throwing up in the hall?"

R: No, she didn't actually see anyone doing it. She just saw the after-effects of it. She just saw the trash can.

M: It's critical that she didn't see anyone throw up in the hall because the four guys claim that the vomiting itself took place in the room. Only when the trash can taken out into the hall.

R: That's my recollection of what she said.

She also told me that she had received a letter from Sharer listing all the problems that were going on with these people; he also told her that the attitude toward him had generally been belligerent.

M: All of them?

R: No, I'll qualify that: John and Steve, Mitch and Peter had generally been cooperative. Scott felt that he could no longer handle the situation. It just wasn't working.

He was requesting that the Administration handle it since he felt that they were the most qualified.

Clement told me that a meeting was being planned for Wednesday. She, Woodward, myself, Scott, and Kathy Mayer would be there. For some reason, Kathy was unable to attend so Barb Stammerjohn came in her place.

When we met, we saw essentially two options as being available to us—Joint Council or Administrative Hearing. Dr. Woodward never said "I think it should be Administrative Hearing" or "I think it should be Joint Council." He asked each of us what we thought it should be.

It didn't matter... I wouldn't be upset had it gone either way. Either I would handle it or I had no qualms about the Administration handling it.

M: Wouldn't it be rather difficult to prepare a proper case in that circumstance? These four guys told us that it was how can you get witnesses, find things in records, etc. if you don't know the specific dates, times, and circumstances of what you're being charged with?

R: I think in drawing up the letters of accusation, Dr. Woodward made it general because there were all the different elements in it and all the different things they'd done.

At the Hearing none of the four produced any witnesses at all. They were asked if they wanted any, but they all said no. And it wasn't a case in which they were charged with doing so and so on Sunday night. It was something which had been going on throughout the semester.

M: If there was only the noise charge, would you have argued for it to go to Joint rather than Administrative Hearing?

R: Yes, because noise is specifically judicial matter.

M: Was there any evidence presented at the Hearing that linked any of the four men to any of the acts of vandalism for which they were on trial?

R: Yeah, but it was agreed by all that that was an accident.

M: The water fountain?

R: Yeah.

M: Outside of that accident...

R: No.

M: So there was no evidence presented, either verbally or by signed disposition, that any of the defendants were guilty of any malicious acts of vandalism?

R: Not specifically. It's just that it occurred on that hall and whenever it had occurred, those four people were there.

M: I assume other people were on the hall as well.

R: Right, but these four were always there—anytime something was broken.

M: But nobody ever actually saw them break anything?

R: No.

M: Given that, and given what you said before about advocating the convening of a Judicial proceeding if no noise was involved, why, at the conclusion of the presentation of testimony, but before adjournment to Dr. Woodward could consider what he'd heard, did you not suggest that the Administrative Hearing be disbanded?

R: Nothing had been presented to the four men to the vandalism charge, and Judicial could decide on the noise question.

R: Just because they said they didn't do it—the letter still charged them with vandalism. There wasn't any direct testimony saying "I saw John" or "I saw Steve."

M: Do you feel that that type of direct testimony is necessary before someone is punished for vandalism?

R: Yes, but I'm not saying they were guilty of vandalism. They were just charged with it. And it was the garbage in the hall and the state of the hall. This can be a minor thing because people do it as pranks, but it's part of the whole thing; there was shaving cream on the doors and stuff like that.

It came out later, at the Administrative Hearing, Dr. Woodward asked both Steve and John if they were satisfied with life as it has been on that hall, if they saw anything at all wrong with the conditions in the hall. Both said no; they saw nothing wrong.

M: Was there any evidence presented at the trial that linked the four men to any of these other things—shaving cream on the doors or whatever?

R: No. But we have to go back to Scott's testimony on his belief that people in the dorm weren't coming forward out of fear of the four guys. Also, the other guys living on the hall who probably would have relevant information, who probably would know if these guys were doing it, wouldn't come and officially say so and so did it. They would come and talk to Scott, and Scott would ask them if they were willing to testify. They would not.

M: Do you feel that people should be able to make accusations to third parties and then have the third parties come into court and testify about what he was told without giving the defendants a chance to cross-examine their accusers?

R: That's one of the reasons we wanted an Administrative Hearing. These hearings have broad-based rules and it is to deal with situations like this. It is not a judicial proceeding.

M: Do you, personally, have any qualms about that? As a representative of the students and as our expert on judicial matters, did it bother you when Scott got up there and said "people came to me who don't want to be identified and told me these things. But I'm not going to tell you who they are, and I'm not going to tell the defendants who they are." Did you have any problems with this and, if so, did you voice any objections at the Administrative Hearing?

R: Not during the Administrative Hearing, because once other people in the dorm knew something was going to be done, they submitted statements.

M: About vandalism and noise?

R: Not about the vandalism.

Scott believed that they should be charged with, or at least asked about, the vandalism. This came out specifically at the Administrative Hearing: a guest of theirs, who was there often apparently did a lot of the damage. All four of them stated in the Hearing that this person had broken this or that.

Scott can't do anything about it because this guest is a resident of another dorm. But these four guys are allowing their friend to tear up their hall and they're not doing anything about it. And you are responsible for your guests, according to The Handbook.

M: So they were charged for the vandalism of their guest?

R: Yes, but this didn't really come out until the Administrative Hearing.

WEBB: In the original charges, WEBB: Did you miss something? Or were they mainly charged because of their reputations as "troublemakers?"

R: That was often the case with Peter, according to Scott. Peter was getting blamed for a lot of vandalism just because he was around a lot. Perhaps I missed something at our Wednesday meeting, but I was under the impression that they had been responsible or were thought to be responsible for some of the vandalism. But at the Administrative Hearing, they said they were not. They named their guest as being responsible... But then Scott reminded them that they were responsible for their guest.

M: This guest business was not mentioned in the original letter notifying them of the charges?

R: No, it was not.

M: So the first they heard about it was in the Hearing itself?

R: As far as I know... Scott may have mentioned it to them earlier in the semester.

M: Was this indirect link between the four men and the vandalism the reason you didn't suggest that the Administrative Hearing be adjourned and Joint Council convened?

R: I guess. It never occurred to me to say "stop, this should go to Joint Council." In my mind, I was perfectly satisfied with the way things were going in the Administrative Hearing.

M: In your mind, were they cleared of the vandalism charges?

R: Yeah, just sitting there hearing the testimony, I believed that they had not done it.

M: In this whole matter, did you consider yourself a representative of the student body of MWC through your office as Judicial Representative?

R: Yes.

M: Given that, and given that you are, I suppose, our foremost authority on judicial matters, why did you personally favor the convening of an Administrative Hearing rather than a Judicial or Joint Council proceeding?

R: I thought the Administration could handle it better.

An interview with President Woodward, who presided at the Hearings and subsequently found the four men guilty.

By PATRICIA A. RINGLE

BULLET: I just would like to ask you a few questions about the trial and about the punishment. I wanted to tell you that you have my word of honor that the four men know that we are contacting several administrators and that they don't mind what questions we ask.

Woodward: They might not mind, but, as the Administrator of the college I don't give out information about procedure that went on in relation to individual students, whether they want to or not. That just isn't the way to maintain and control the privacy.

B: Would you mind answering some of the questions?

Woodward: That depends entirely on what the questions are. I'll be glad to tell you that we had an Administrative Hearing and that three students were denied the privilege of living on campus. That's about all I can tell you.

B: Was there a transcript made of this?

Woodward: No, there was no transcript.

B: There was no tape made?

Woodward: No and I'm not going to go into any more detail about the hearing. If you don't like the participants they can tell you all about it.

B: There seems to be some discrepancy between what they've said and what others have said to us. And since we did want to get an objective...

Woodward: I can tell you exactly how you can be 100 percent correct on that: look in the student Handbook, pages 29-30. Exactly the procedure set down there to be followed was followed.

B: One thing we're not quite clear on is exactly what they're being punished for. And I don't think they're quite clear on it either.

Woodward: They've received a statement of charges against them in writing.

209 Williams Street  
Fredericksburg, Virginia  
Sandwich Shop and Pizza House

13 inch

1.75

PIZZA

17 inch

2.25

variety of subs.....1.25  
Mary Washington Veg. Sub....1.25  
Greek Souvlaki.....1.45  
Greek Taco......95  
Egg Plant Parmigiana.....1.45  
Greek Pastries......50



# A Closer Look at the Unresolved Issue

By HELEN MARIE McFALLS  
and MICHAEL MELLO

Toward the end of last semester an Administrative Hearing was convened. The circumstances surrounding the hearing have raised questions which the BULLET felt that the issue needs further clarification. (Mitch Sproul, the fourth man, has graduated.) They hold that the questions involving the charges and the verdicts

An interview conducted with Mitch Sproul, Peter Back, John Bartenstein, and Steve Calhoun, the four men accused of vandalism of college property and excessive noise disturbance.

BULLET: Could you give us some background?

SPROUL: Wednesday (November 23) we got called by Dean Clement and she said that we'd hear from her again. She said "Mitch, you're to go to Dr. Woodard's office as soon as possible." I said o.k. Then she talked to the others. So we went over, and I figured he'd just say "hey, what the hell's going on?" Well that wasn't it at all; he said there was going to be an Administrative Hearing on what went on, and that it would be held on Tuesday. He also said that until then, we'd be suspended from the residence hall. Everyone was going home that week-end for Thanksgiving, but still there were Saturday and Monday nights that we couldn't stay in the dorm.

We were told that we could have group or individual hearings, and we decided to have individual hearings.

BULLET: When did you all get the letters from Dr. Woodard notifying you of the charges against you?

SPROUL: Wednesday.

BARTENSTEIN: Saturday.

BULLET: Were you aware of precisely what acts of vandalism or "conduct unbecoming" to a member of an academic community you were being charged with before you actually appeared at the Hearing?

SPROUL: No.

BACK: No, but we could tell that people were upset over certain acts of vandalism. There was the broken phone platform—everybody knew—Scott Sharer knew, that it had been broken by somebody in another dorm.

There were obvious things in the hall that had been broken, and we knew that that was what the vandalism charge stemmed from.

BULLET: Did they ever say that?

BARTENSTEIN: No, not before the hearing.

SPROUL: No.

BULLET: How do you feel about Dr. Woodard hearing your case?

SPROUL: The big problem I have with this thing is that it went as far as an Administrative Hearing.

BULLET: You feel that it should have been heard by Judicial Court or Joint Council?

BARTENSTEIN: Yeah, it should have been handled by the Student Government.

SPROUL: Yeah, when they went through the specific charges we had, vandalism at the Hearing, I said "I can say, unequivocally and under full knowledge of the Honor Code, that in four years here I've never vandalized any piece of College property." And I think, in my case, they have believed that; so far as Pete, John, and Steve are concerned, I can't say. So I'm basically being kicked out for noise.

BULLET: Have you ever received a hall offense?

BULLET: Mitch, you were not

are as yet vague and that it should be made clear that they were not responsible for the accused breakage. (The incidents of vandalism were accounted for from sources other than the four accused.) They also think that the initial BULLET news article concerning this situation adequately related the factual details but did not present the complete occurrences surrounding the Administrative Hearing.

We, the BULLET Staff, feel that the most objective way to deal with this matter is to allow the major participants to state their positions in their own words and to let the campus decide for itself.

SPROUL: No. I've never had a hall offense.

BARTENSTEIN: I've gotten two, for leaving a back door open. And that was the night before the Hearing.

BACK: I've never gotten one; neither has Steve.

BULLET: Is Scott Sharer, Westmoreland's Judicial Representative, the one who brought the charges in this case, was he the plaintiff?

SPROUL: Nobody knows, really. Nobody told us who was accusing us.

BULLET: Had Sharer told you, verbally, informed you at any time, to turn down the noise?

SPROUL: Oh, yeah. He had at times come down and told us that we were making too much noise. We did make a lot of noise.

BULLET: Did you ask, at the trial, who was accusing you?

SPROUL: I never got around to it.

BARTENSTEIN: It seemed like everybody was prosecuting us. Everybody had their little report.

SPROUL: Woodard, Clement, Barnes, Sharer—they all talked.

BULLET: Did you have any trouble preparing a defense, getting witnesses and stuff, because the charges set forth in Dr. Woodard's letter were so vague?

SPROUL: I had a hell of a time preparing a defense, because I didn't think I'd done a goddam thing wrong.

BARTENSTEIN: It was hard to prepare a defense against "conduct unbecoming" because you didn't know exactly what you were preparing against.

BULLET: Did you try to discover, ahead of time, exactly what you were being charged with?

SPROUL: He mentioned the noise and the vandalism; he just didn't say "one, two, three." But at the meeting on Wednesday, he said "I don't want to talk about anything trial related."

He made that real clear.

BULLET: But the vandalism charges were made more specific at the hearing itself?

SPROUL: Yeah.

BACK: They had it all broken down. They knew who had broken each of the things in the hall, and it wasn't us. Steve Calhoun had once broken a piece of a water fountain, but someone else in another dorm admitted to the other stuff; he said, "yeah, I broke it and I'll pay for it." I thought that that was it. Sharer knew it.

BULLET: So were you acquitted of the vandalism charges?

SPROUL: Nobody knows what we were acquitted of. Upon hearing his (Woodard's) decision in my case, I asked him what the allegations against me were. He said "everything we talked about in the Hearing."

BACK: He gave me the same answer. I said "if we're going to be thrown out of our dorms, do we get to know what it's for." He said "well, the things we talked about in the Hearing."

BULLET: Mitch, you were not

thrown out of the dorm?"

SPROUL: Right. I graduate in December, 1977; I think that helped me. Plus, at times my case, and the allegations against me were different.

BULLET: So you all don't know what you're being punished for? Vandalism or noise or what?

BACK: Right.

BARTENSTEIN: I didn't think they'd do anything like this. They were really upset about the things being broken, but that was the main reason it was supposed to go to Administrative Hearing. Scott Sharer told me that vandalism doesn't come under Judicial, it doesn't come under Honor, so it has to go to Administrative Hearing.

So here I am, not guilty of any of this vandalism, and I still go to Administrative Hearing.

BULLET: But you don't know whether or not they felt you were guilty of the vandalism?

BACK: I don't know how they could, because Scott Sharer said the names of the ones who had admitted doing it.

BARTENSTEIN: If they had thought we'd done the vandalism, we'd have broken the Honor Code.

BULLET: What kind of evidence was presented by the Administration on the vandalism and noise?

SPROUL: Sharer, Barnes.

BACK: Nobody testified that they saw us do anything, because we didn't do anything.

BULLET: Nobody testified that they saw any of the vandalism?

BACK: No. That's right.

BULLET: When Sharer said "we" decided that it should go above Judicial, what was "we"?

SPROUL:

Scott told me of a meeting between him, Clement, Woodard, Reeves and Stannerjohn. He said that he himself had recommended that it wasn't a Judicial proceeding, that he didn't feel Judicial could handle it. I guess they all decided that it should go to Administrative Hearing.

BULLET: Could you have council at trial?

BACK: Woodard said "you can have a lawyer there, but I'm not going to have mind."

SPROUL: Again, when you didn't do anything wrong, you don't want to truck in there on the defensive.

BARTENSTEIN: Yeah. When Woodard called me at home, I figured that I could get witnesses and I could prove where I was when the vandalism happened. I was over at Willard when one happened. I could go get sign-in sheets and witnesses. But since I hadn't done it, I figured that it was up to them to prove I had done it.

BULLET: They know who did all the vandalism?

BACK: Scott Sharer knew.

SPROUL: But not all the vandalism in every case. Let me explain something. That weekend before Thanksgiving, the hall was rowdy. Unquestionably, I'm not going to sit here and tell you that we're holier than thou. Mike Mello knows better. We can be noisy.

The phone platform being broken was the thing that brought it to a head. That really upset a lot of people in the dorm. I knew there was going to be trouble, and when I talked to Scott, I said that the phone thing was really a problem. No question. They were convinced that all the damage to the hall had happened that weekend, like the animals had all of a sudden gone crazy and started breaking things. And I tried to make clear at my hearing that that wasn't the case: the only things that got broken on the hall that weekend were the phone table and a door on the hall.

I was aware of who did this, and I talked to Scott about it on Tuesday. I said that the breakage thing is way

out of hand. I'm not into breakage at all; I can tell you who did it. And I told him. So Scott knew.

BULLET: Bearing in mind the Honor Code, were any of you responsible for any of the acts of vandalism for which you were charged?

SPROUL: No.

BACK: No.

BARTENSTEIN: Except for a water fountain I accidentally broke.

BULLET: How about the noise?

BACK: They said that girls were complaining about the noise. When we asked why they never came down and talked to us about it, we were told that the girls were intimidated and people were generally afraid to walk down our hall. We were also told that because of our noise, two people were moving off campus. These guys never came to us and said we were too loud.

BULLET: Who was saying this?

BACK: Scott Sharer.

BULLET: Outside of you three, Barnes, and Sharer, who else testified?

SPROUL: Clement gave about a three-minute rap.

BULLET: Am I correct in assuming that no eyewitnesses were presented that linked you to any malicious acts of vandalism, that you testified under the Honor Code that you didn't do any of the vandalism, and still you weren't cleared of that charge?

BARTENSTEIN: We weren't told what charges we were guilty of and which we weren't.

BULLET: So it seems that you are being punished for noise, since no evidence was...

BACK: That's what we assumed.

BULLET: What about the vomiting incident?

SPROUL: Usually after lunch, we'd all roll back to the dorm and sit around, play around, whatever. On Tuesday, Dean Clement came over to the hall to view the damage the night before. She came over about 11:00.

Well, it is kind of a joke that we ... well, as I said it at the hearing, sometimes when young men get together, the humor gets kind of coarse. Pete and another student were there, and this other student said "I feel sick."

Pete said "Well, go in there and get sick," and Seth said "O.K." I was laughing. So he does end up getting sick in our room. I'm the kind of person who can't look at someone get sick without getting sick myself, so when I saw the other student get sick I got up to leave the room. I didn't make it; I came back in and threw up in a trash can sitting in the middle of the room. We were laughing the whole time, because it's funny as hell, and I told that to Dean Clement.

BULLET: I think Pete threw up and a couple of other people there might have thrown up. What wasn't funny was that I went out on the porch, where I threw up some more; I mean, I was violently ill. I came back into the hall, my eyes are watering. I'm cleaning up my mouth and who's standing there but Dean Clement. I said "Dean Clement, how's it going," and he said "Well, Mitch, I'm not doing too well" and I said "me either." Then she got really pissed off, and she said "you guys are beasts. I want you to just get in your rooms, close your doors and shut up."

I think she missed the point of the whole thing. She thought we were just vomiting everywhere, whereas we were vomiting in trash receptacles. Apparently the first thing she saw was Pete chasing somebody around the hall with this trash can.

BULLET: Were you planning on dumping it over his head or something?

BACK: No. I had just never seen this guy puke. When Mitch came in and threw up, my guy threw up in another trashcan.

SPROUL: I apologized to Dean Clement at my hearing. I tried to apologize to her the day it happened. I got her on the phone, and she was so cold that I said "Dean Clement, I'd like to talk to you." She said "OK, call back later this afternoon;" I had the impression that she wasn't that interested in seeing me. But I did apologize to her at my hearing: I said "Dean Clement, in a million years I wouldn't

have chosen to expose you to that."

We just had no idea she was coming down the hall.

BARTENSTEIN: She said that it was the most animalistic thing she's ever seen, at my hearing.

BULLET: Is it fair to say that no one besides Dean Clement was intimidated by this behavior? No one on the hall?

SPROUL: No there was no one ...

BULLET: No one else was exposed to it?

BACK: No. Nobody puked in the hall. It was all in the room.

BULLET: Do you know why this case went to Administrative Hearing rather than Judicial or Joint?

SPROUL: I have no idea.

BULLET: Did you try to find out why?

SPROUL: Yes. At my hearing, I said "I'm not sure that this should have gone as far as Administrative Hearing; I apologize for taking up the Administrations time."

BARTENSTEIN: I asked why it didn't go through the judicial system, and Scott just said that it was his prerogative.

I know one possible reason. Earlier in the year, Pete and I got in trouble for a visitation thing. Scott Sharer wrote out a piece of paper saying that we agreed to certain punishment—closing the dorm doors for a week. This was in lieu of a going to Judicial Court. At the end he wrote "and any further violation will be dealt with to the fullest extent of College law."

At the Hearing, Scott said, "you signed that and that's why you're here."

BULLET: That's a pile of ... I never signed anything like that and never did Steve.

BULLET: That phrase "to the fullest extent of the law" still meant that the correct judicial channels must be followed. That has to do with punishment rather than process; it doesn't mention anything about Administrative Hearing. Joint Council can punish to the "full extent of the College law," it can suspend and expel.

SPROUL: It has to do with Scott's love for power; he loves to write official complaints.

BACK: Yeah. He sent notes and said he was going to start kicking asses. He sent one guy who had torn up Scott's hall offense to him two envelopes. One contained the torn up hall offense and a note that said "it stands." The other one was just to show what a real power trip he's on, began "from the Desk of Scott R. Sharer."

He said that by tearing up the hall offense, this person was walking on very thin ice. He said that if this person wanted to take a swing at him, he could, but he better get him with the first punch because Scott never gave anyone a second chance. He did that type of thing all the time.

John and Steve had a real personality clash with Scott.

BARTENSTEIN: It seemed that he was always threatening us.

BULLET: How long have you been suspended from Westmoreland?

BARTENSTEIN: For the rest of the year. The rest of this and next semester.

BULLET: Do you feel that your defense was seriously considered before the decision was rendered?

SPROUL: I think the decision was made before we even went in.

BULLET: Why?

SPROUL: We all know the history of Administrative Hearings at MWC. This is the first one since Galloway and Flat. I think there was already a decision made that some action be taken.

BULLET: Mitch, why do you suppose your punishment was lighter than the other three?

SPROUL: Let me explain some psychology to you first. We all became really tight on the hall this semester. My worst punishment has been this solitary confinement, they've stripped me of my really good friends. But as a crew, it has known that at times I had been a controlling, moderating influence: I'd say "Oh my God, don't break that" or whatever. Also, my first statement at the Hearing was that I could swear, under the Honor Code, that I'd never done any vandalism. I think that went over well.

I don't think there's any question that Scott Sharer had a lot of input in this whole thing. I mean, he read a report at the Hearing that must have been nine pages long. The allegations against me were different, he said that he could deal with me and Pete, but with Steve and John this wasn't always the case. Scott said he couldn't handle these two: he said they weren't rational.

BULLET: Are you all paying for any of the vandalism?

BACK: No. The guy who did it was going to pay for it; we were still working it out.

BULLET: Is there any appeal?

BARTENSTEIN: No.

BULLET: Was there any transcript or any kind of taped record kept of the proceeding?

BARTENSTEIN: No.

BULLET: There was a rumor that the case went to Administrative Hearing because vandalism is a state crime as well as a broad College regulation. Did you hear anything about it?

SPROUL: It was never pointed out to me.

BULLET: Did you all have your own witnesses there?

BACK: No.

BARTENSTEIN: I thought about it, but I didn't want to go in on the defensive. I had two days to prepare a case, and I couldn't go into any dorms to get witnesses.

BULLET: But you could have asked for an extension if two days wasn't enough.

BARTENSTEIN: I never thought of that.

BULLET: Are you making any effort to find out precisely what you are being punished for?

SPROUL: The effort has been made.

BARTENSTEIN: My parents came down this morning. I thought they'd get something. They kept asking "what was my son charged with?" and he just kept saying "well ..."

And they also wanted to know why the Judicial System was bypassed. He just said that was the big authority. He just kept saying that it was his decision: he was going to handle things at his college.

BULLET: Do you feel that your rights were violated?

SPROUL: Oh yeah.

BULLET: What bothers you the most about this whole affair?

SPROUL: That I never did anything wrong, and I'm being punished.

BULLET: Will this go on your permanent record?

SPROUL: No. I asked them.

BACK: There's one letter that goes in. Something about having to live off campus.

BULLET: Are you planning to take any of this to court?

SPROUL: I'd seriously consider it if I were going to be here next year. The cost ... I'm really just tired of it. I want to be rid of it. I realize there's a principle involved and I'd probably be doing the whole campus a favor, but the opportunity costs just aren't there.

BARTENSTEIN: My mother didn't want to do it because she's worked in education for a long time and she didn't think we'd win a suit against a state-supported school. She was interested in suing Scott Sharer for malicious intent. She feels that this whole thing cost me an "F" in my Fantasy Class. She thinks it hurt my grade.

My parents don't want me coming back to school here. After talking to Woodard this morning, they don't want me coming back here so long as Woodard was in office ...

SPROUL: You have to go through it to believe it.

BULLET: Do you feel that these charges were brought, and the case was handled this way because you are male?

SPROUL: I don't think there's any question about that. But that's just because males are different from females and that's something that MWC hasn't been able to accept. Can you imagine females getting together and having a group cheer? Females don't break things. MWC has never learned to deal with males.

## LIKE NEW

## USED TRANSPORTATION

10% Student Discount w/I.D.

1969 Dodge Dart	\$ 375
1966 Ford Falcon	\$ 395
1971 Pinto	\$ 975
1967 Camaro	\$1295
1968 Camaro	\$1595
1969 Toyota	\$ 995
1971 Toyota	\$1495
1974 Vega	\$1295
1973 Grand Prix	\$3195
1970 Chevy Convertible	\$1595
1973 Vega	\$ 595
1968 Pontiac LeMans	\$ 450

Over 100 Cars To Choose From  
Open 7 days a week 10:00 a.m.

## DISCOUNT AUTO SALES

Rte. 12 miles north of Ft. Burd  
3 miles from MWC  
371-5800 371-9982

## THE Mad Hatter

UNISEX HAIR SHOP

Now in

Park & Shop

major credit card

no appointment necessary but taken

Featuring the Latest Unisex Hair Designs and Dementional Coloring.

\$850

Shampoo, cut and blow dry, Conditioning included

with student I.D. Bring this coupon.

Open Monday-Friday 9-9  
Saturday 9-5

Featuring dementional coloring design perms and design cuts



Luncheon & Dinner served 7 days, 11-9  
Dinner served, 5-9  
Sunday Buffet 12-3

MWC Dinner Special

10% discount with student I.D.

Afternoon study break treats \$1.50

303 Fauquier Street

Colonial Fare

in a Charming setting

373-1645

## LITTLE PROFESSOR

BOOK CENTER

Fredericksburg Park and Shop Shopping Center

New Releases & Old Favorites  
Hardbacks & Paperbacks

Monarch & Cliffs Notes

Special Section of Sale Books  
Magazines

Posters & Photographs by Barry Fitzgerald

## January Jubilee

January starts off with a bang as this semester opens up with the January Jubilee sponsored by Class Council. Running from January 19 through January 22, this weekend is chocked full of exciting events—so sit back and read on!

The weekend begins Thursday night, January 19, with Nantucket appearing in concert along with the Jesse Bolt Band in the GF G.W. auditorium from 8:00 to 11:00 p.m. The concert is \$2.00 for Mary Washington students and \$3.00 for guests. Tickets will be sold in the foyer of A.C.L. (outside C-Shop) on Tuesday and Wednesday from 10:00 to 5:00 and at the door on Thursday night as well.

To continue the events of the weekend, Friday, January 20, at 7:30 a giant bonfire will blaze M.W.C.'s way to a victory over Christopher Newport in basketball later that evening. This event will take place on the M.W.C. golf course where hot chocolate will be served also.

It's Beantlemania time this Saturday, January 21, from 1:00 to 3:30 P.M. when the two hit Beale movies, "Hard Days Night" and "Let It Be" play at G.W. Along with these greats will be Flash Gordon and twenty-five minutes of cartoons to entertain and tickle your funny bone. The fun lasts all afternoon, so come and go as you please. There is no admission charge—just lots of watching and listening enjoyment.

Saturday evening, January 21, from 8:00 'til midnight a Semi-formal Keg

Party will be held at the A.C.L. Ballroom. The band Blazin' from Williamsburg will bring you dancing tunes. Unlike regular keg parties, beer will be served pub style in the C-Shop only, allowing for a more formal decor in the ballroom. Tickets will be sold at the door as usual, so feel free to come stag! Admission is \$1 for Mary Washington students and \$2.00 for guests with a college or military I.D. Guys wear slacks or good pants, and girls wear nice pants or dresses. Please dress nicely because no jeans will be allowed. Come, drink, and be merry!

Last but not certainly not least, Sunday, January 22 will bring us to the Powderpuff Basketball Game in the Gym at Goodrick from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. Anyone can participate. We'll have the girls signed up as basketball players and the guys signed up to be cheerleaders. Everyone come to support the participants; the cheerleaders might need more support than the basketball players! Just kidding, guys! Practice sessions for the Powderpuff basketball team participants will be from 7:30 to 8:30 p.m. Thursday, January 19, at Goodrick Gym with Ronnie Synan as coach. Practice sessions for the male cheerleaders will be headed by Laura Bruel at 6:00 p.m. in the Auxiliary Gym at Goodrick on the same evening.

So remember, come out and see all that is happening this eventful weekend. It is sure to be the best weekend M.W.C. will have seen yet!

## Basketball Victory for Men's Basketball Suffers Loss

By CANDY SAMS

On Saturday, January 14, the Mary Washington girls' basketball team hosted the St. Mary's Saints for a grueling defeat 32-59.

The MWC girls had a tough time catching up to St. Mary's from the start as St. Mary's came alive to take control of the game. St. Mary's out-shot MWC to take the halftime lead 36-12. The frustrated MWC girls came back in the second half to apply more shooting pressure but it wasn't enough to overpower St. Mary's lead.

MWC had a lot of well-intended shots but the magic touch wasn't there to make them count for the lead. Their numerous turnovers interrupted their otherwise smooth pace and St. Mary's took full advantage of it. St. Mary's squad had a number of shots inside the key while MWC relied mainly on their outside shots. Good offensive and defensive rebounding efforts by Mary Alice Robinson, Anne Hanky, Kim Warker, Jody Mooradian and Patty Shillington kept the MWC offense alive but St. Mary's team hung on to their 27 point lead for the final 32-59 score.

The girls' have a number of away games coming up, but keep in mind that they'll have a home game February 4 against Randolph-Macon.

On Tuesday, January 11 and Wednesday, January 12, the Mary Washington College men's basketball team played two very tough teams—Southeastern and St. Mary's College—to start off their second semester season. The men lost to both teams, Southeastern 66-83, and St. Mary's 82-95, but so much can still be said about how they keep up with these teams throughout the games. Southeastern's victory was due to good shots and powerful rebounds which outdid the MWC ball club. Southeastern had a tall and tough squad whose zoned defense gave MWC's offense a lot of pressure. MWC had a lot of turnovers which Southeastern used to their advantage.

Southeastern held the halftime score 38-33, but MWC wasn't far behind and was well on their way to catching up. The second half of the game was very important for both teams—MWC to catch up and Southeastern to hold their lead. MWC didn't give up and kept more shots coming from the floor. The leading scorers for MWC were sophomore Ron Synan with 15 points, freshmen Kevin Martin—14 points, and Butch Griffen with 14 points. The leading rebounders were seniors Wally Scott (9), Ron Synan (6), and Butch Griffen (6). MWC held on, and kept up with Southeastern for a 45-58 third quarter score, but then Southeastern raced away with an 83-66 final score.

On Wednesday, January 11, the MWC men's team hosted the sharp-shooting St. Mary's Saints. The St. Mary's squad controlled the pace of the game with quick rebounds, sharp dribbling and constant shots on the board. MWC didn't give up though, because they applied their own pressure for an exciting second half.

St. Mary's clearly used MWC's turnovers and off-shooting to possess the halftime score 42-29. The frustrated MWC squad came back out on the court in the second half to immediately put points on the board. Kevin Martin, Ron Synan, Frank Fitzpatrick, Wally Scott, Paul Hawke, Pat Pekinpaugh and Duke Stableford kept St. Mary's defense busy with inside and outside shots on the right side of the basket, while Mark Holmberg, Butch Griffen, Kevin Martin and Frank Fitzpatrick kept shots coming in from the middle and left side. The

leading scorers for MWC were Ron Synan with 17 pts., Wally Scott—14 pts., Frank Fitzpatrick—12 pts., and Kevin Martin—11 pts. The leading MWC rebounders were Wally Scott (15) and Mark Holmberg (10) who both kept MWC's offense on their toes. MWC almost caught up to St. Mary, 53-63, with a ten point difference in the third quarter. Then St. Mary

toughened up and sped on to win 95-82. The MWC men's basketball team offers a lot of excitement for the crowd with their shooting skill and enthusiasm, so come support them in their next game this Friday, January 20 when they host Christopher Newport College at 7:30 p.m. See You There!



RON SYNAN (NO. 32) HITS A JUMP SHOT against Southeastern College. The sophomore transfer student was high scorer for MWC in their Jan. 11 game.

## Classifieds

Full and part-time sales people needed. Call 11-8371-5575, Monday-Friday.

'4' from page 5

BARTENSTEIN: If we go down and tell our friends at Tech or Randolph Macon that we got kicked out for noise, they laugh and say "what?" SPROUL: I have a friend in Kansas City who still doesn't believe me.

BULLET: They don't. The entire male population at MWC is still in its formative stage, even though it's been years since the school went coed. I said that at my Hearing. It's a black mark on males.

BULLET: You do know of any future inquests of this type being planned?

SPROUL: Second-floor Bushnell is next, I've heard.

BULLET: Thank you all very much for your time, gentlemen.

Reeves from page 4

M: Do you still feel you made use right decision in favoring the convention of an Administrative Hearing?

R: Yes.

M: Were you satisfied with the final judgment and the way in which it was given?

R: Yes.

M: If another case involving vandalism were to come up, would you again favor an Administrative Hearing?

R: I can't see any other way. The students can't access for damages or fines for damages. It has to be the College.

M: Perhaps Joint Council could determine innocence or guilt and then leave it to the College to bill them if they're found guilty?

R: I suppose it can be done that way.

M: Let's say a case comes up where the person admits that he's vandalized College property and offers to pay for it. Do you think that Joint Council should decide on any further social punishment, re: whether to throw him out of the dorm?

R: I tend to say no, because his actions are against College property.

M: So you feel that all cases of vandalism should be decided by the Administration?

R: Yes. M: Do you feel that it was the students, not the Administration, who decided to send this case to Administrative Hearing?

R: Yes. M: Okay, thank you very much, Cindy.

# ADAM'S RIB LOUNGE

## at Horne's Motor Lodge

### No. 1 in Top 40 & Disco

### Live Entertainment

Open 5-1:30 a.m.  
Entertainment from  
9-1:30 a.m.

featuring  
next week



Demetri Callas  
and the  
Hollywood Coolbreeze Band

Ladies' nights Tuesday  
Monday Nights MWC Nights  
Cover Charge \$1 Friday & Saturday, Closed Sunday

Good Food at  
Reasonable Prices



U.S. 1  
at  
I-95

Hours:  
6 a.m.-10 p.m.

Welcome Back Mary Washington Students  
Try Our Weekday Specials

Mon.—Bone-In Sirloin Strip	2.99
Tues.—Rib-Eye Steak	1.89
Wed.—Top Sirloin Steak	2.69
Thur.—Rib-Eye Steak	1.89

Includes: Potato, Toast and our All you can eat salad bar



156 ROOMS

New color TV's  
Special tour or group  
rates welcome

(703) 898-6800